

Financial Regime-Switching Vector
Auto-Regression
Amendment October 2010
New claims, Office Action and Response

Application Number 10/805,314
Mark S. Tenney
Filed 22 March 2004
TC/A.U. 4172
Examiner William E. Rankins
Docket Number MST032204

Wednesday 20th October, 2010

Copyright ©2010 All rights reserved Mark S. Tenney.

Citizen of the United States

4313 Lawrence Street, Alexandria Virginia, 22309.

Phone number 703 799 0518.

Email: mfc@patriot.net

Contents

1	Intro	19
1.1	Modified introduction to response to March 4, 2010	20
2	Annotated Amendment to the Specification	25
2.1	Underlining review	26
2.2	Remove sentence	26
2 – 1	new definition	27
2.3	Additions to Specification	27
3 – 1	Steps in Regime Switching Economic Scenario Generation	28
3 – 1.1	Regime Switching VAR Time Node Step	28
3 – 1.2	Regime Switching Time Node Loop	31

3 – 1.3 Scenario	32
3 – 1.4 Scenario Initialization	33
3 – 1.5 Scenario Loop	33
3 – 1.6 Regime Switching Scenario	34
3 – 1.7 Regime Switching Grids	34
3 – 1.8 One space variable one regime index example	35
3 – 1.9 Two space variable one regime index example	38
3 Claims	41
4 Office Opening	51
4.1 Office Action Opening	51
4.2 Response to September 22/23 2010 Office Action	51
2 – 1 Complete listing of the claims	51
2 – 2 Claims in ascending Order	52
2 – 3 Cover sheet and signature	52
4.3 Status of Claims	53
3 – 1 Office Statement	53

CONTENTS	5
3 – 2 Applicant Response to Office Statement	53
4.4 Response to Arguments.	53
4 – 1 Applicant Response to Office Statement	53
5 Office Specification Rejection	55
5.1 Specification Rejection New Matter	55
1 – 1 Office Statement	55
1 – 2 Applicant Response to Office Statement	56
1 – 2.1 2163.06	56
1 – 2.2 Annotated version of specification cites source for contents added	56
1 – 2.3 Examiner asked for tutorial	58
1 – 2.4 Applicant offered tutorial on side	59
1 – 2.5 Examiner said put tutorial in the specification	59
1 – 2.6 Applicant complied with examiner instruction	59
1 – 2.7 Measure theory makes finance very hard to read	62

1 – 2.8	Difficulty of math finance materials	64
1 – 2.9	Beaglehole Tenney 1991 and Bernanke praise Double Decay	64
1 – 2.10	Terminology of additions is used in specifica- tion or prior work or is in industry	66
1 – 2.11	Comparison of difficulty level of what added to finance literature and industry use	66
1 – 2.12	Comparison to Libor Market Model as typ- ically presented at a more difficult level for lay person	67
1 – 2.13	Request examiner to admit he asked for ap- plicant to draft a tutorial explanation for him in the personal interview	70
1 – 2.14	Request examiner to admit he instructed ap- plicant to put the tutorial in the specification not just give it him on the side for just him. .	70

CONTENTS	7
1 – 2.15 Request no new matter admission over original specification	70
6 Claims Rejections	71
6.1 Claim Rejections 35 USC 101	71
1 – 1 Office Statement Zero Statutory Classes in Claims 25 to 27	71
1 – 2 Applicant response	72
1 – 2.1 Applicant adopts method of use of a computer as start of redrafted claim	72
1 – 2.2 Comparison to claim 1 of 6125355 patent	72
1 – 2.3 Office contradictory statements where admit claims are to a method and apparatus	73
1 – 2.4 Computer system was used to indicate a method of using a computer.	76
1 – 2.5 In the Bansal claims 25 to 27 based rejections, USPTO reads in use of a computer as intended.	76

1 – 2.6 Use of computer indicated in specification	77
1 – 2.7 Examiner asked for improvement format which implies improvement of something already statutory	77
1 – 2.8 Applicant requests admission that applicants current ESG computer software system is statutory	77
1 – 2.9 Applicant requests admission that improvements to applicants current ESG computer software system are statutory	78
1 – 2.10 Applicant requests admission that Academy of Actuaries ESG computer software system is statutory	78
1 – 2.11 Applicant requests admission that improvements of Academy of Actuaries ESG computer software system is statutory	80

CONTENTS

9

1 – 2.12 Applicant requests USPTO to admit that using Economic Scenario Generators to comply with NAIC LHATF actual or draft regulations is statutory	80
1 – 2.13 Applicant requests USPTO to admit that using Economic Scenario Generators to comply with NAIC LHATF VM-20 actual or draft regulations is statutory	81
1 – 2.14 Applicant requests USPTO to draft claims . .	81
1 – 2.15 Equal protection and due process admissions requested	81
1 – 3 Office Statement Two Classes both method and apparatus in claims 29-31, 33-36, and 38-39	82
1 – 4 Applicant Response to Office Statement 2 Classes Issue	83
1 – 4.1 1 class not 2. method is the class in claims . .	83
1 – 4.2 Redraft to the method of using a computer . .	84

1 – 4.3 Ambiguity in phrase computer system	84
1 – 4.4 6125355 patent claim one	84
1 – 4.5 6125355 patent discussion	85
1 – 5 Office Statement Mathematical Operations only 25-29 .	91
1 – 6 Applicant Response to Office Statement	91
1 – 6.1 Note other 101 responses	91
1 – 6.2 USPTO read computer into Bansal for claim 25 to 27	91
1 – 6.3 USPTO finds two statutory classes for claim 29	92
1 – 6.4 USPTO derived one of the statutory classes in claim 29 from claim 28 already having a statutory class	93
1 – 6.5 USPTO conflicting statements	93
1 – 6.6 Bernanke praises practical use of BT 1991 model	94

<i>CONTENTS</i>	11
1 – 6.7 USPTO Bansal intends computer use	95
1 – 6.8 Practical use of ESG admission requested . .	96
1 – 6.9 ESG's as much practical use as auto parts . .	98
1 – 6.10 LHATF NAIC practical use of ESGs	98
1 – 6.11 Solvency 2 practical use ESG	98
1 – 6.12 Additions to the specification	99
1 – 6.13 People losing their homes is of practical im- portance .	103
1 – 6.14 Better economic scenario methods help pre- vent financial crises	103
1 – 6.15 Improvements over what Bernanke praised are of practical value .	104
1 – 6.16 Applicant has licensed DMRP ESG software without regime switching for over 10 years . .	105
1 – 6.17 What is sold in commerce is of practical value	105

1 – 6.18 Applicant's methods are already widely used to manage risk in finance	106
1 – 6.19 Applicant repeats request to USPTO to draft claims	107
6.2 112 Rejection New Matter	108
2 – 1 Office Statement	108
2 – 2 Applicant Response to Office Statement	108
2 – 2.1 Examiner requested tutorial at basic intro level	108
2 – 2.2 Applicant offered tutorial to examiner on side	109
2 – 2.3 Examiner said to put the tutorial in the spec- ification.	109
2 – 2.4 Annotated version of specification cites source for contents added	111
2 – 2.5 Terminology already in specification and or prior work of applicant	112

2 – 2.6 For more detail see this amendment earlier discussion specification rejection	113
2 – 2.7 Discussion	114
2 – 2.8 Request examiner to admit he asked for applicant to draft a tutorial explanation for him in the personal interview	115
2 – 2.9 Request examiner to admit he instructed applicant to put the tutorial in the specification not just give it him on the side for just him. .	115
2 – 2.10 Request no new matter admission over original specification	115
2 – 2.11 Request no new matter in claims admission over original specification	116
2 – 2.12 Requests USPTO to draft claims for pro se based on original specification	116
6.3 112 Rejection Antecedent Basis	118

3 – 1	Office Statement	118
3 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement	120
3 – 2.1	MPEP quotation	120
3 – 2.2	Standard terms	124
3 – 2.3	More reference on outside of sphere and like	124
3 – 2.4	Time node an essential part of a scenario	124
3 – 2.5	Process to stochastic process	125
3 – 2.6	Scenarios in preamble in one case	125
3 – 2.7	Expected change is standard term and an inherent part like outside of sphere	125
3 – 2.8	New Claims	126
3 – 2.9	Applicant happy to work with examiner on antecedent basis as other things	126
3 – 2.10	More on Specification Addition request at personal interview	127
6.4	112 Rejection Method Apparatus	128

4 – 1	Office Statement Claims 29-31, 33-36, and 38-39 are method and apparatus at same time	128
4 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement	129
4 – 2.1	Computer System Phrase avoided in redraft .	129
6.5	103 Rejections	129
5 – 1	Office Statement Claim 25	129
5 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement	134
5 – 2.1	USPTO recognizes "computer system used above" in applicant claim 25 not just math- ematical operations and reads computer sys- tem into Bansal paper	134
5 – 2.2	Rejection on Bansal missed equity	134
5 – 2.3	Bansal CIR model has no equities	135
5 – 2.4	Why USPTO asked for introductory expla- nation added to specification.	136
6.6	Additional 103 Rejections	138

6 – 1	Office Statement Claim 26 USPTO reads use computer method into Bansal not just mathematical operations	138
6 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement Claim 26	139
6 – 3	Office Statement Claim 27 USPTO reads use computer method into Bansal not just mathematical operations	139
6 – 4	Applicant Response to Office Statement Claim 27	140
6 – 4.1	Further on computer and intended use	140
6 – 5	Office Statement Claims 28-39 same rationale	141
6 – 6	Applicant Response to Office Statement	141
6 – 6.1	Claims 28-39 contain matter not in Bansal	142
6 – 6.2	Claims 28-31 have DMRP not in Bansal	142
6 – 6.3	32-35 additional restrictions over Bansal	142
6 – 6.4	Claims 35-36 use numerical method unlike Bansal closed form formula	143
6 – 6.5	Claim 37-39 use exponential short term rate not in Bansal which is linear	143

CONTENTS	17
6 – 6.6 Applicant can help USPTO avoid mistakes in understanding like Bansal here	144
6 – 6.7 Applicants prior published formulas are a ba- sic part of math of the CIR models which Bansal builds on	145
6 – 6.8 Relation to other parts of amendment	145
7 Office Action Conclusion	149
7.1 Conclusion	149
1 – 1 Office Statement	149
1 – 2 Applicant Response to Office Statement	151
8 Closing	153
Bibliography	153

